

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 13, 2003, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-58 are pending in the present application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 21, 35, and 45 hereby. No claims have been canceled or added.

Claims 1-17, 19-22, 24, 26-27, 29-30, 32-47, 50-51, 53 and 55-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Saegusa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,518,957 to Lehtinen et al. ("Lehtinen"). Dependent claims 18, 23, 25, 28, 31, 48-49, 52, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saegusa in view of Lehtinen and Aoki. To the extent any of these rejections might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, it is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-58 are pending in this application, and claims 1, 11, 21, 35 and 45 are independent claims. The Office Action acknowledged that Saegusa does not teach a microprocessor that disables a display (claims 1, 11), deactivates normal operation of a wireless device (claims 21, 45), or deactivates a display (claim 35). However, the Office Action asserted that Lehtinen teaches a processor that disables a display and establishes a wireless communication session with a called party. Thus, the Office Action asserted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Saegusa adapt to include a microprocessor that disables a display because this would allow for cellular telephone to transmit information while operating in an emergency mode.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and argues that all claims are allowable for at least the following reason.

Amended claim 1 recites a wireless device for reporting an emergency situation to a called party, wherein when a keystroke sequence is received by the keyboard, the microprocessor disable the display, mutes incoming audio signals, and establishes a wireless communication session. Similar amendments regarding the "muting" feature has been made to other independent claims 11, 21, 35, and 45. The support of the amendment can be found at, for example, page 13, lines 13-15. As described in the specification, when specific keystroke sequence is received by the microprocessor, "display 130 of wireless device 100 can immediately go inactive, giving an appearance that wireless device has been turned off. . . . Moreover, incoming audio can also be muted so that noise is not heard from wireless device 100."

Lehtinen discloses a communication device, of which a part of touch sensitive screen 6 is deactivated when a voice communication channel is established. As described in col. 3, lines 25 to 31, the deactivation of touch sensitive screen 6 is to make sure that the ear or the cheek of the user will not accidentally activate an application during a voice call by means of the touch sensitive screen 6. The deactivation, however, is not intended for muting incoming audio signals so that noise is not heard from the communication device or suspending normal operation of the communication device. Indeed, after touch sensitive screen 6 is deactivated, the communication device of Lehtinen is used by the user as a portable telephone to receive and/or make a phone call. It is impossible for the communication device to receive and/or make a call if incoming audio signals are muted.

Accordingly, neither Saegusa nor Lehtinen teaches or suggests the feature of "muting the incoming audio signal" when a keystroke sequence is received by the keyboard, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 11, 21, 35, and 45. Based on the reasons described above, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the device of Saegusa to include the processor of Lehtinen to achieve the present invention.

Accordingly, all rejections to independent claims 1, 11, 21, 35 and 45 are believed to have been overcome. Applicant believes that all these claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant also believes that all dependent claims 2-10, 12-20, 22-34, 36-44, 46-58 are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependencies from patentable independent claims.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703-770-7900

Respectfully submitted,

DANNIE E. MARTIN

Date: January 29, 2004

By:


Wan-Ching Y. Montfort

PCC/CYM